arXiv:1609.07531v1 [cs.GT] 23 Sep 2016

Popular Matchings with Multiple Partners

Florian Brandl[1] and Telikepalli Kavitha[2]

[1] Technische Universität München, Germany. brandlfl@in.tum.de
[2] Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, India. kavitha@tcs.tifr.res.in

Abstract. Our input is a bipartite graph $G = (R \cup H, E)$ where each vertex in $R \cup H$ has a preference list strictly ranking its neighbors. The vertices in R (similarly, in H) are called *residents* (resp., *hospitals*): each resident seeks to be matched to a hospital while each hospital h seeks $\mathsf{cap}(h) \geq 1$ many residents to be matched to it. The Gale-Shapley algorithm computes a stable matching in G in linear time. We consider the problem of computing a *popular* matching in G – a matching M is popular if M cannot lose an election to any other matching where vertices cast votes for one matching versus another. Our main contribution is to show that a max-size popular matching in G can be computed by the *2-level Gale-Shapley* algorithm in linear time. This is a simple extension of the classical Gale-Shapley algorithm and we prove its correctness via linear programming.

1 Introduction

We study the one-to-many matching problem, also known as the hospitals/residents problem. Formally, this is given by a set of residents R and a set of hospitals H, where every hospital h has a capacity $\mathsf{cap}(h) \geq 1$. Every resident seeks to get matched to a hospital and every hospital h seeks to get matched to $\mathsf{cap}(h)$ residents. Moreover, every resident $r \in R$ has a strict ranking $\succ_r$ over hospitals that are acceptable to r and every hospital h has a strict ranking $\succ_h$ over residents that are acceptable to h. The set of mutually acceptable pairs is given by $E \subseteq R \times H$. Thus our input is a bipartite graph $G = (R \cup H, E)$ and the preferences of a vertex are expressed as an ordered list of its neighbors, e.g., $u\colon v, v'$ denotes the preference $v \succ_u v'$, i.e., u prefers v to v'.

Definition 1. *A matching M in $G = (R \cup H, E)$ is a subset of E such that $|M(r)| \leq 1$ for each $r \in R$ and $|M(h)| \leq \mathsf{cap}(h)$ for each $h \in H$, where $M(u) = \{v : (u, v) \in M\}$.*[3]

The goal is to compute an *optimal* matching in G. The usual definition of optimality in this setting has been *stability* [22]. A matching M in G is said to be stable if there is no resident-hospital pair (r, h) that "blocks" M. We say a pair (r, h) blocks M if (1) either r is unmatched in M or r prefers h to $M(r)$ and (2) either h has less than $\mathsf{cap}(h)$ partners in M or h prefers r to its worst partner in $M(h)$. The Gale-Shapley algorithm can be easily generalized to find a stable matching in $G = (R \cup H, E)$ as was shown by Gale and Shapley [7].

Since a stable matching is a maximal matching in G, its size is at least $|M_{\max}|/2$, where $M_{\max}$ is a max-size matching in G. This bound can be tight as shown by the following simple example: let $R = \{r, r'\}$ and $H = \{h, h'\}$ where each hospital has capacity 1 and the edge set is $E = \{(r, h), (r, h'), (r', h)\}$. The preferences are shown in the table below. Here the only stable matching (red line) is $S = \{(r, h)\}$, which is of size 1. However, the max-size matching (dashed lines) is $M_{\max} = \{(r', h), (r, h')\}$, which is of size 2.

$r\colon h, h'$	$h\colon r, r'$
$r'\colon h, h'$	$h'\colon r, r'$



It can be shown that all stable matchings have to match the same set of residents and every hospital gets matched to the same capacity in every stable matching. This is popularly called the "Rural Hospitals Theorem" [8,23]. More precisely, Roth [23] showed that not only is every hospital matched to the same number of residents in every stable matching, but moreover, every hospital that is not matched up to its

[3] For $r \in R$, we assume $M(r) = h$ if $M(r) = \{h\}$, whenever suitable.

capacity in some stable matching is actually matched to the same *set of residents* in any stable matching. Thus the usual notion of stability is very restrictive.

From a social point of view it seems desirable to have a higher number of residents matched to hospitals in order to keep fewer residents unemployed and guarantee sufficient staffing for hospitals. The latter point particularly applies to rural hospitals that oftentimes face the problem of being understaffed with residents by the National Resident Matching Program in the USA (cf. [22,23]). A similar point could be made for matching workers to firms or students to seminar seats. This motivates relaxing the notion of "absence of blocking edges" to a weaker notion of stability so as to obtain matchings that are guaranteed to be significantly more than $|M_{\max}|/2$. Note that we do not want to wish to ignore the preferences of vertices and impose a max-size matching on them as such a way of assigning partners will be socially undesirable as it does not take into account the preferences of vertices. Thus we would like to use a notion of optimality that replaces the *local* stability notion of "no blocking edges" with a weaker notion that is democratic or *globally* stable and achieves more "global good", i.e., its size is always at least $\gamma \cdot |M_{\max}|$ for some $\gamma > 1/2$.

Popularity. Popularity is such a notion. The notion of popularity was introduced by Gärdenfors [9] in the stable marriage problem, i.e., the one-to-one setting (each vertex has capacity 1). Popular matchings have been well-studied here [3,13,16,12,6,17] and we generalize them to the hospitals/residents setting now. In the one-to-one setting, given any two matchings M_0, M_1 in G and a vertex u, we say u prefers M_0 to M_1 if u prefers $M_0(u)$ to $M_1(u)$, where we say "$M_i(u) = \text{null}$" if u is left unmatched in matching M_i, for $i = 0, 1$ — note that the null option is the least preferred state for any vertex u in a matching. We will use the function $\mathsf{vote}_u(v, v')$ for any vertex u and neighbors v, v' of u that is defined as follows: $\mathsf{vote}_u(v, v')$ is 1 if u prefers v to v', it is -1 if u prefers v' to v, else it is 0 (i.e., $v = v'$).

For any two matchings M_0, M_1 in G and a resident r, we define $\Delta_r(M_0, M_1) = \mathsf{vote}_r(M_0(r),\ M_1(r))$ where as before, we adopt the convention that "$M_i(r) = \text{null}$" for a resident r left unmatched in M_i, for $i = 0, 1$. We would now like to define $\Delta_h(M_0, M_1)$ for a hospital h. If h is not matched up to its capacity in M_i, we will say "$M_i(h) = \text{null}$" with multiplicity equal to $\mathsf{cap}(h) - |M_i(h)|$ and the null state is the least preferred state for h.

Voting by hospitals. When we compare the preference of a hospital h with $\mathsf{cap}(h) = 3$ for $S_0 = \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$ versus $S_1 = \{r_4, r_5, r_6\}$ (where r_i is the i-th ranked resident in h's preference list), we would like h's vote to capture the fact that h is better-off by *3 residents* in S_0 when compared to S_1. So while comparing one matching versus another, we allow a hospital to cast more than one vote. Let h be any hospital and let S_0, S_1 be any subsets of the set of h's neighbors where we add some occurrences of "null" to make S_0, S_1 sets of size $\mathsf{cap}(h)$. We will view the sets $S_0' = S_0 \setminus S_1$ and $S_1' = S_1 \setminus S_0$ as arrays $\langle S_i'[1], \ldots, S_i'[k] \rangle$ (for $i = 0, 1$), where $k = \mathsf{cap}(h) - |S_0 \cap S_1|$. The preference of hospital h for S_0 versus S_1, denoted by $\delta_h(S_0, S_1)$, is defined as follows:

$$\delta_h(S_0, S_1) = \min_{\sigma \in \Pi[k]} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathsf{vote}_h(S_0'[i], S_1'[\sigma(i)]), \tag{1}$$

where $\Pi[k]$ is the set of permutations on $\{1, \ldots, k\}$. Let $\Delta_h(M_0, M_1) = \delta_h(S_0, S_1)$. So $\Delta_h(M_0, M_1)$ counts the number of votes by h for $M_0(h)$ versus $M_1(h)$ when the sets $S_0' = M_0(h) \setminus M_1(h)$ and $S_1' = M_1(h) \setminus M_0(h)$ are being compared in the order that is most adversarial or *negative* for M_0. That is, this order $\sigma \in \Pi[k]$ of comparison between elements of S_0' and S_1' gives the least value for $n^+ - n^-$, where n^+ is the number of indices i such that $S_0'[i] \succ_h S_1'[\sigma(i)]$ and n^- is the number of indices i such that $S_0'[i] \prec_h S_1'[\sigma(i)]$.

For instance, when a hospital h with $\mathsf{cap}(h) = 3$ compares two subsets $S_0 = \{r_1, r_3, r_5\}$ and $S_1 = \{r_2, r_4, r_6\}$ (where r_i is the i-th ranked resident in h's preference list), we have $\delta_h(S_0, S_1) = -1$ since comparing the following pairs results in the least value of $\delta_h(S_0, S_1)$: this pairing is (r_1 with r_6), (r_3 with r_2), (r_5 with r_4). This makes $\delta_h(S_0, S_1) = 1 - 1 - 1 = -1$. While computing $\delta_h(S_1, S_0)$, the pairing would be (r_2 with r_1), (r_4 with r_3), (r_6 with r_5): then $\delta_h(S_1, S_0) = -1 - 1 - 1 = -3$.

For any two matchings M_0 and M_1 in G, we compare them using the function $\Delta(M_0, M_1)$ defined below.

$$\Delta(M_0, M_1) = \sum_{u \in R \cup H} \Delta_u(M_0, M_1).$$

We say M_0 is at least as popular as M_1 if $\Delta(M_0, M_1) \geq 0$ and M_0 is more popular than M_1 if $\Delta(M_0, M_1) > 0$. If $\Delta(M_0, M_1) \geq 0$ then for every hospital h in H: *no matter in which order* the elements

of $S'_0 = M_0(h) \setminus M_1(h)$ and $S'_1 = M_1(h) \setminus M_0(h)$ are compared against each other by h in the evaluation of $\Delta_h(M_0, M_1)$ – when we sum up the total number of votes cast by all hospitals and residents, the votes for M_1 can *never* outnumber the votes for M_0.

Definition 2. *M_0 is a popular matching in $G = (R \cup H, E)$ if $\Delta(M_0, M_1) \geq 0$ for all matchings M_1 in G.*

Thus for a matching M_0 to be popular, it means that M_0 is at least as popular as every matching in G, i.e., there is no matching M_1 such that $\Delta(M_0, M_1) < 0$. If there exists a matching M_1 such that $\Delta(M_0, M_1) < 0$ then this is taken as a certificate of *unpopularity* of M_0. It is not obvious whether popular matchings always exist in G.

Our definition of popularity may seem too strict and restrictive since for each hospital h, we choose the most negative or adversarial ordering for $M_0(h) \setminus M_1(h)$ versus $M_1(h) \setminus M_0(h)$ while calculating $\Delta_h(M_0, M_1)$. A more relaxed definition may be to order the sets $S'_0 = M_0(h) \setminus M_1(h)$ and $S'_1 = M_1(h) \setminus M_0(h)$ in increasing order of preference of h and take $\sum_i \mathsf{vote}_h(S'_0[i], S'_1[i])$ as h's vote. An even more relaxed definition may be to choose the most favorable or *positive* ordering for S'_0 versus S'_1 while calculating $\Delta_h(M_0, M_1)$.

Definition 3. *Call a matching M_0* weakly popular *if $\Delta(M_1, M_0) \leq 0$ for all matchings M_1 in G.*

Thus M_0 is a weakly popular matching if the sum of votes for M_0 is at least the sum of votes for any matching M_1 when each hospital h compares $M_0(h) \setminus M_1(h)$ versus $M_1(h) \setminus M_0(h)$ in the ordering that is most favorable for M_0. Thus "weak popularity" is a more relaxed notion than "popularity" and a max-size weakly popular matching could presumably be larger than a max-size popular matching.

Our results. We will show that every stable matching in $G = (R \cup H, E)$ is popular, thus our definition of popularity is a relaxation of stability. This also shows that popular matchings always exist. We will present a simple linear time algorithm for computing a max-size popular matching M_0 in G and show that $|M_0| \geq \frac{2}{3} \cdot |M_{\max}|$.

We also show that M_0 is more popular than every *larger* matching, i.e., $\Delta(M_0, M_1) > 0$ for any matching M_1 that is larger than M_0. Thus M_0 is also a *max-size weakly popular matching* in G as no matching M_1 larger than M_0 can be weakly popular due to the fact that $\Delta(M_0, M_1) > 0$.

Akin to the rural hospitals theorem, we show that all max-size popular matchings have to match the same set of residents and every hospital gets matched to the same capacity in every max-size popular matching. However every hospital that is not matched up to its capacity in some max-size popular matching does *not* need to be matched to the same set of residents in any max-size popular matching, which is in contrast to stable matchings [23].

Techniques. Our algorithm is an adaptation of the 2-level Gale-Shapley algorithm from [16] that finds a max-size popular matching in a stable marriage instance. Our main contribution here is to show that this algorithm computes a max-size popular matching in the hospitals/residents setting as well. While the analysis of the 2-level Gale-Shapley algorithm in [16] is based on a structural characterization of popular matchings (from [13]) on forbidden alternating paths and alternating cycles, we will use linear programming to show the correctness of this algorithm here.

Our linear programming techniques are based on a linear program that was used in [18] to find a popular fractional matching in a bipartite graph with *1-sided preference lists*. The popular fractional matching polytope shown in [18] was also used in [17] to show the popularity of some half-integral matchings in the stable marriage problem. We do not design a popular fractional matching polytope for the hospitals/residents problem – instead we focus on the matching M_0 obtained via the 2-level Gale-Shapley algorithm and use linear programming on a certain weighted graph G'_{M_0} that we build here.

Background and related work. The first algorithmic question studied in popular matchings was in the domain of 1-sided preference lists [1] where it is only vertices on the left, who are *agents*, that have preferences; the vertices on the right are *objects* and they have no preferences. Popular matchings need not always exist here, however fractional matchings that are popular always exist and can be computed in polynomial time via linear programming [18].

Popular matchings always exist in any instance of the stable marriage problem with strict preference lists since every stable matching is popular [9]. Efficient algorithms to find a max-size popular matching

in a stable marriage instance are known [13,16] and a subclass of max-size popular matchings called *dominant matchings* was studied in [6]. While a max-size popular matching can be easily computed here, there is no polynomial time algorithm currently known for computing a min-cost popular matching when there is a cost function on the edge set. A polynomial time algorithm was shown in [17] to find a min-cost popular *half-integral* matching. When preference lists admit ties, the problem of determining if the given instance admits a popular matching or not is NP-hard [3,5].

The stable matching problem in a marriage instance has been extensively studied – we refer to the books [10,19] on this topic. The problem of computing stable matchings or its variants in the hospitals/residents setting is also well-studied [2,11,14,15]. The stable matching algorithm in the hospitals/residents problem has several real-world applications – it is used to match residents to hospitals in Canada [4] and in the USA [21].

2 Our algorithm

In this section we describe the "2-level Gale-Shapley algorithm" (earlier used in [16]) to compute a max-size popular matching in $G = (R \cup H, E)$. This algorithm works in the graph $G' = (R' \cup H, E')$ defined as follows: R' consists of two copies r_0 and r_1 of every resident r in R, i.e., $R' = \{r_0, r_1 : r \in R\}$. The set H of hospitals in G' is the same as in G and the edge set here is $E' = \{(r_0, h), (r_1, h) : (r, h) \in E\}$.

The preference list of r_i (for $i = 0, 1$) is exactly the same as the preference list of r. The elements in the set $\{r_i : r \in R\}$ will be called *level* i residents, for $i = 0, 1$. Every $h \in H$ prefers any level 1 neighbor to a level 0 neighbor: within the set of level i neighbors (for $i = 0, 1$), h's preference order is the same as its original preference order. For instance, if a hospital h has only 2 neighbors r and r' in G where $r \succ_h r'$, the preference order of h in G' is: $r_1,\ r'_1,\ r_0,\ r'_0$.

At any point in time, only one of r_0 and r_1 will be *active* in our algorithm. To begin with, all level 0 residents are active in our algorithm and all level 1 residents are inactive. We keep a queue Q of all the active residents and they propose as in Gale-Shapley algorithm:

- every active unmatched resident r_i who has neighbors in G' proposes to its most preferred neighbor in G'
- in case r_0 has no neighbors in G', then r_0 becomes inactive and r_1 becomes active and it joins the queue Q.

Algorithm 1 *Input:* $G' = (R' \cup H, E')$; *Output: A matching* M *in* G'

1. Initialize $Q = \{r_0 : r \in R\}$ and $M = \emptyset$.
2. **while** $Q \neq \emptyset$ **do**
3. delete the first vertex from Q: call it r_i.
4. **if** r_i has one or more neighbors in G' **then**
5. – let h be the most preferred neighbor of r_i in G'. Add the edge (r_i, h) to M.
6. **if** h is matched to more than $\mathsf{cap}(h)$ neighbors in M **then**
7. – let r'_j be h's worst partner in M. {*"worst" as per preferences in* G'}
8. – delete the edge (r'_j, h) from M and add r'_j to Q.
9. **end if**
10. **if** h is matched to $\mathsf{cap}(h)$ many neighbors in M **then**
11. – delete all edges (s_k, h) from G' where s_k is a neighbor in G' that is ranked worse than h's worst partner in M. {*this is again according to preferences in* G'}
12. **end if**
13. **else if** $i = 0$ **then**
14. – add r_1 to Q. {r_0 *has no neighbors in* G' *and so* r_1 *gets activated* }
15. **end if**
16. **end while**
17. Return the matching M.

When a hospital h receives a proposal from r_i, the hospital h accepts this offer. If h is now matched to more than $\mathsf{cap}(h)$ partners then h rejects its worst partner r'_j in the current matching and so r'_j will have to find a new partner now and it joins Q.

If h is now matched to $\mathsf{cap}(h)$ partners then we delete all edges (s_k, h) from G' where s_k is a neighbor in G' that is ranked worse than h's worst partner in the current matching – so no such resident s_k can propose to h later on in the algorithm. Once Q becomes empty, the algorithm terminates. A description of our algorithm is given as Algorithm 1.

Let M be the matching returned by this algorithm and let M_0 be the matching in G that is obtained by projecting M to the edge set of G, i.e., $(r_i, h) \rightsquigarrow (r, h)$ for every edge (r_i, h) in M, where $i \in \{0, 1\}$. We will prove that M_0 is a max-size popular matching in Section 3.

3 The correctness of our algorithm

In this section we show a sufficient condition for a matching N in G to be popular. This is shown via a graph called G'_N: this is a bipartite graph constructed using N such that N gets mapped to a *simple matching* N' in G'_N, i.e., $|N'(u)| \leq 1$ for all vertices u in G'_N.

The vertex set of G'_N includes $R \cup H'$ where $H' = \{h_i : h \in H \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq \mathsf{cap}(h)\}$. That is, for each hospital h, there are $\mathsf{cap}(h)$ many copies of h in H'. For each edge (r, h) in G such that $N(r) = h$, we will arbitrarily choose a distinct $j \in \{1, \ldots, \mathsf{cap}(h)\}$ and call $h_j = N'(r)$. If h was not fully matched in N, i.e., it has less than $\mathsf{cap}(h)$ many partners in N, then some h_i's will be left unmatched in N'.

1. For each edge (r, h) in G such that $N(r) \neq h$, we will have edges (r, h_i) in G'_N, for $1 \leq i \leq \mathsf{cap}(h)$.
2. For each edge (r, h) in G such that $N(r) = h$, we will have the edge (r, h_j) in G'_N where $h_j = N'(r)$.

Thus for any edge $e = (r, h) \notin N$, there are $\mathsf{cap}(h)$ many copies of e in G': these are (r, h_i) for $1 \leq i \leq \mathsf{cap}(h)$. However for any edge $(r, h) \in N$, there is only *one* edge (r, h_j) in G'_N where $h_j = N'(r)$, in other words, for $i \neq j$, the resident r is not adjacent to hospital h_i in G'_N.

There are also some new vertices called "last resort neighbors" in G'_N: for any $u \in R \cup H'$, there is one such vertex $\ell(u)$ and every vertex u ranks $\ell(u)$ at the bottom of its preference list.

3. The edge set of G'_N also contains the edges $(u, \ell(u))$ for each $u \in R \cup H'$.

The purpose of the vertex $\ell(u)$ is to capture the state of u being left unmatched in any matching so that every matching in G gets mapped to an $(R \cup H')$-*complete matching* in G'_N, i.e., one that matches all vertices in $R \cup H'$. We will use these last resort neighbors to obtain an $(R \cup H')$-complete matching N^* from N'.

$$N^* = N' \cup \{(u, \ell(u)) : u \text{ is unmatched in } N'\}.$$

Thus every resident r unmatched in N gets matched to $\ell(r)$ in N^* and if a hospital h was not fully matched in N, then some h_i's will be matched to their last resort neighbors in N^*. We now define edge weights in G'_N.

- For any edge $e = (r, h_i) \in R \times H'$: the weight of edge e is $\mathsf{wt}_N(e) = \mathsf{vote}_r(h, N(r)) + \mathsf{vote}_h(r, N'(h_i))$. Note that for each edge $e \in R \times H'$, we have $\mathsf{wt}_N(e) \in \{\pm 2, 0\}$ and $\mathsf{wt}_N(e) = 2$ if and only if e blocks N.
- For any edge $e = (u, \ell(u))$: the weight of edge e is $\mathsf{wt}_N(e) = \mathsf{vote}_u(\ell(u), N^*(u))$. Thus $\mathsf{wt}_N(u, \ell(u)) = -1$ if u was matched in N' and $\mathsf{wt}_N(u, \ell(u)) = 0$ otherwise (in which case $N^*(u) = \ell(u)$).

Observe that every edge $e \in N^*$ satisfies $\mathsf{wt}_N(e) = 0$. Thus the weight of the matching N^* in G'_N is 0. We will show in Theorem 1 that if *every* $(R \cup H')$-complete matching in the graph G'_N has weight at most 0, then N is a popular matching in G. We will show later that the matching M_0 obtained from our algorithm satisfies this condition.

3.1 A sufficient condition for popularity

The following theorem shows a sufficient condition for a matching N to be popular in G.

Theorem 1. *Let N be a matching in G such that every $(R \cup H')$-complete matching in G'_N has weight at most 0. Then N is popular.*

Proof. Suppose not. That is, let N be an *unpopular* matching in G. So there exists a matching T in G such that $\Delta(N,T) < 0$. We will show a realization T^* of T in G'_N such that T^* is an $(R \cup H')$-complete matching. That is, each edge $(r,h) \in T \rightsquigarrow (r,h_k) \in T^*$ for some k such that (r,h_k) is in G'_N and T^* will also have some appropriate $(u,\ell(u))$ edges.

(i) For every edge $(r,h) \in N \cap T$ do: set $T^*(r) = N^*(r)$; thus if $(r,h_j) \in N^*$ then (r,h_j) belongs to T^* as well.
(ii) For every r that is matched in T and $T(r) \neq N(r)$, we have to decide the index k such that $T^*(r) = h_k$ where $T(r) = h$. In the evaluation of $\Delta_h(N,T)$, while comparing the sets $N(h) \setminus T(h)$ and $T(h) \setminus N(h)$:
   – let $r' \in N(h)$ be the resident that h compares r with. So the matching N^* contains the edge (r',h_j) for some j. Set $T^*(r) = h_j$.
   – if r is compared with "null" by h (so h is not fully matched in N), then we set $T^*(r) = h_j$ for some j such that $(h_j,\ell(h_j)) \in N^*$ and h_j is unmatched so far in T^*.
(iii) For any vertex $u \in R \cup H'$ that is left unmatched in steps (i)-(ii) above, set $T^*(u) = \ell(u)$.

It is easy to see that T^* is a valid matching in G'_N and it matches all vertices in $R \cup H'$. We will now show that $\mathsf{wt}_N(T^*) > 0$. We have $\mathsf{wt}_N(T^*) = \sum_{e \in T^*} \mathsf{wt}_N(e)$.

$$\sum_{e \in T^*} \mathsf{wt}_N(e) = \sum_{(r,h_i) \in T^*} \big(\mathsf{vote}_r(T(r),N(r)) + \mathsf{vote}_h(T^*(h_i),N^*(h_i))\big) + \sum_{(u,\ell(u)) \in T^*} \mathsf{vote}_u(\ell(u),N^*(u)) \tag{2}$$

$$= \sum_{r \in R} \mathsf{vote}_r(T^*(r),N^*(r)) + \sum_{h \in H} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathsf{cap}(h)} \mathsf{vote}_h(T^*(h_i),N^*(h_i)) \tag{3}$$

$$= -\sum_{r \in R} \Delta_r(N,T) - \sum_{h \in H} \Delta_h(N,T) \tag{4}$$

$$= -\Delta(N,T). \tag{5}$$

We have $\mathsf{wt}_N(r,h_i) = \mathsf{vote}_r(h,N(r)) + \mathsf{vote}_h(r,N^*(h_i))$ from the definition of edge weights in G'_N. By grouping together for each h, the edges (r,h_i) for all $r \in T(h)$ and any possible $(\ell(h_i),h_i)$ edges, we get the right side of Eqn. (3). Crucially, Eqn. (4) follows from how we constructed the matching T^*: for each hospital h, we have $\sum_i \mathsf{vote}_h(N^*(h_i),T^*(h_i)) = \Delta_h(N,T)$ and so $\sum_i \mathsf{vote}_h(T^*(h_i),N^*(h_i)) = -\Delta_h(N,T)$.

The total sum of all the terms $\Delta_u(N,T)$ for $u \in R \cup H$ is $\Delta(N,T)$. Since $\Delta(N,T) < 0$, it follows that the weight of T^* is positive. Thus there is a matching with positive weight in G'_N that matches all vertices in $R \cup H'$. This contradicts the fact that every $(R \cup H')$-complete matching in G'_N has weight at most 0. Hence N is a popular matching. □

We now apply the above theorem to show that every stable matching in G is also a popular matching.

Corollary 1. *Every stable matching in G is popular.*

Proof. Let S be any stable matching in G. Consider the graph G'_S: since S has no blocking edge in G, it follows that every edge e in G'_S satisfies $\mathsf{wt}_S(e) \leq 0$. Thus every matching in G'_S has weight at most 0 and so by Theorem 1, we can conclude that S is popular. □

3.2 The popularity of M_0

We will now use Theorem 1 to prove the popularity of the matching M_0 computed in Section 2. We will construct the matchings M'_0, M^*_0 and the graph G'_{M_0} corresponding to the matching M_0 as described in the early part of Section 3. Our goal is to show that every $(R \cup H')$-complete matching in G'_{M_0} has weight at most 0. Note that the matching M^*_0 has weight 0 in G'_{M_0}.

In order prove that every $(R \cup H')$-complete matching in the graph G'_{M_0} has weight at most 0, we will partition the set R into $R_0 \cup R_1$ and the set H' into $H'_0 \cup H'_1$ as follows. Initially $R_0 = R_1 = H'_0 = H'_1 = \emptyset$. For each edge $(r,h_j) \in M'_0$ do:

– if $(r_0, h) \in M$ then add r to R_0 and h_j to H'_0; else (i.e., $(r_1, h) \in M$) add r to R_1 and h_j to H'_1.

Recall that $M \subseteq R' \times H$ is the matching in the graph G' obtained at the end of the 2-level Gale-Shapley algorithm (see Algorithm 1) and the projection of M on to $R \times H$ is M_0.

The definition of the sets R_0, R_1, H'_0, H'_1 implies that $M'_0 \subseteq (R_0 \times H'_0) \cup (R_1 \times H'_1)$. Also add residents unmatched in M'_0 to R_1 and hospitals unmatched in M'_0 to H'_0. Thus we have $R = R_0 \cup R_1$ and $H' = H'_0 \cup H'_1$ (see Fig. 1).



Fig. 1. $R = R_0 \cup R_1$ and $H' = H'_0 \cup H'_1$: all hospitals h_i left unmatched in M'_0 are in H'_0 and all residents r left unmatched in M'_0 are in R_1. Note that $M'_0 \subseteq (R_0 \times H'_0) \cup (R_1 \times H'_1)$.

Theorem 2 will show that the matching M_0 satisfies the condition of Theorem 1 and this will imply that M_0 is a popular matching in G. This proof is inspired by the proof in [17] that shows the membership of certain half-integral matchings in the popular fractional matching polytope of a stable marriage instance.

Theorem 2. *Every $(R \cup H')$-complete matching in G'_{M_0} has weight at most 0.*

Proof. Let our primal LP be the max-weight $(R \cup H')$-complete matching problem in G'_{M_0}. We want to show that the primal optimal value is at most 0. We will do this by showing a dual feasible solution with value 0. The primal LP is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \sum_{e \in G'_{M_0}} & \mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(e) \cdot x_e & & \\ \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{e \in E'(u)} & x_e = 1 & & \text{for all } u \in R \cup H', \\ & x_e \geq 0 & & \text{for all } e \in G'_{M_0}, \end{aligned}$$

where $E'(u)$ is the set of edges incident on u in G'_{M_0}.

The dual LP is the following: we associate a variable α_u to each vertex $u \in R \cup H'$.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \sum_{u \in R \cup H'} & \alpha_u & & \\ \text{subject to} \quad \alpha_r + \alpha_{h_i} & \geq \mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(r, h_i) & & \text{for all } (r, h_i) \in G'_{M_0}, \quad (6) \\ \alpha_u & \geq \mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(u, \ell(u)) & & \text{for all } u \in R \cup H'. \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

Consider the following assignment of α_u-values for all $u \in R \cup H'$: set $\alpha_u = 0$ for all u unmatched in M'_0 (each such vertex is in $R_1 \cup H'_0$) and for the matched vertices u in M'_0, we set α_u-values as follows: $\alpha_u = 1$ if $u \in R_0 \cup H'_1$ and $\alpha_u = -1$ if $u \in R_1 \cup H'_0$.

Observe that Inequality (7) holds for all vertices $u \in R \cup H'$. This is because $\alpha_u = 0 = \mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(u, \ell(u))$ for all u unmatched in M'_0; similarly, for all u matched in M'_0 we have $\alpha_u \geq -1 = \mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(u, \ell(u))$. In order to show Inequality (6), we will use Claim 1 stated below (its proof is given after the proof of Theorem 2).

Claim 1 *Let (r, h_i) be any edge in G'_{M_0}.*

(i) If $(r, h_i) \in R_1 \times H'_0$, *then* $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(e) = -2$.
(ii) If $(r, h_i) \in (R_0 \times H'_0) \cup (R_1 \times H'_1)$, *then* $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(e) \leq 0$.

- Claim 1 (i) states that for every edge $(r, h_i) \in R_1 \times H'_0$ in G'_{M_0}, we have $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(r, h_i) = -2$. Since $\alpha_u \geq -1$ for all $u \in R_1 \cup H'_0$, Inequality (6) holds for all edges of G'_{M_0} in $R_1 \times H'_0$.
- Claim 1 (ii) states that for every edge (r, h_i) in $(R_0 \times H'_0) \cup (R_1 \times H'_1)$, we have $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(r, h_i) \leq 0$. Since $\alpha_u + \alpha_v \geq 0$ for all $(u, v) \in R_k \times H'_k$ (for $k = 0, 1$), Inequality (6) holds for all edges of G'_{M_0} in $(R_0 \times H'_0) \cup (R_1 \times H'_1)$.

Since $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(e) \leq 2$ for all edges e in G'_{M_0} and we set $\alpha_u = 1$ for all vertices $u \in R_0 \cup H'_1$, Inequality (6) is satisfied for all edges of G'_{M_0} in $R_0 \times H'_1$. Thus Inequality (6) holds for all edges (r, h_i) in G'_{M_0} and so these α_u-values are dual feasible.

For every edge $(r, h_i) \in M'_0$, we have $\alpha_r + \alpha_{h_i} = 0$ and $\alpha_u = 0$ for vertices u unmatched in M'_0. Hence it follows that $\sum_{u \in R \cup H'} \alpha_u = 0$. So by weak duality, the primal optimal is at most 0. In other words, every matching in G'_{M_0} that matches all vertices in $R \cup H'$ has weight at most 0. □

Proof of Claim 1. Consider any edge $(r, h_i) \in R_1 \times H'_0$ in G'_{M_0}. Note that the matching M_0 does not contain the edge (r, h) – if it did, then G'_{M_0} would have only one copy of this edge, say (r, h_j), which being an edge of M'_0 has to be in either $R_0 \times H'_0$ or $R_1 \times H'_1$ whereas we are given that $(r, h_i) \in R_1 \times H'_0$. The resident $r \in R_1$, i.e., r_1 got activated in our algorithm and recall that every hospital prefers level 1 neighbors to level 0 neighbors in our algorithm. So if r_1 had proposed to h, then this offer would have been accepted since h had at least one partner who was a level 0 resident (since $h_i \in H'_0$). Thus r_1 must have been accepted by a neighbor that r prefers to h. Hence r prefers its partner in M_0 to h, so $\mathsf{vote}_r(h, M_0(r)) = -1$.

The resident r_0 was rejected by all its neighbors (including h) and became inactive. When h rejected r_0, the hospital h was matched to $\mathsf{cap}(h)$ neighbors, each of which was preferred by h to r_0. Thereafter, h may have received (and accepted) better offers from its neighbors and since $h_i \in H'_0$, the hospital h never received enough offers from level 1 neighbors to have all its partners as level 1 residents. In particular, h_i is matched to a level 0 neighbor that is preferred to r_0. Thus h_i prefers its neighbor in M'_0 to r, so $\mathsf{vote}_h(r, M'_0(h_i)) = -1$. So it follows that $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(r, h_i) = -2$.

We will now show part (ii) of this lemma. In our algorithm, the preference order of each hospital h, when restricted to level 0 neighbors, is its original preference order and similarly, its preference order when restricted to level 1 neighbors, is its original preference order. Thus for each edge (r, h_i) in G'_{M_0} where $(r, h_i) \in (R_0 \times H'_0) \cup (R_1 \times H'_1)$, either (1) h_i prefers its partner in M'_0 to r or vice-versa or (2) $(r, h_i) \in M'_0$. In both cases, we have $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(r, h_i) \leq 0$. □

3.3 Maximality of the popular matching M_0

We need to show that M_0 is a max-size popular matching in G and we now show that this follows quite easily from the proof of Theorem 2. Let T be any matching in G. We can obtain a realization T^* of the matching T in G'_{M_0} that is absolutely analogous to how it was done in steps (i)–(iii) in the proof of Theorem 1. Thus T^* is an $(R \cup H')$-complete matching in G'_{M_0} and $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(T^*) = -\Delta(M_0, T)$.

We know from Theorem 2 that $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(T^*) \leq 0$. Suppose T is a popular matching in G. Then $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(T^*)$ has to be 0, otherwise the popularity of T is contradicted since $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(T^*) < 0$ implies that $\Delta(M_0, T) > 0$ (because $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(T^*) = -\Delta(M_0, T)$).

So if T is a popular matching in G, then T^* is an optimal solution to the maximum weight $(R \cup H')$-complete matching problem in G'_{M_0}. Recall that this is the primal LP in the proof of Theorem 2. We will use complementary slackness to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let T be a popular matching in G and let T^* be the realization of T in G'_{M_0}. Then for any vertex $u \in R \cup H'$ we have: $(u, \ell(u)) \in M_0^*$ implies $(u, \ell(u)) \in T^*$.*

Proof. Consider the α-values assigned to vertices in $R \cup H'$ in the proof of Theorem 2. This is an *optimal dual* solution since its value is 0 which is the value of the optimal primal solution. Thus complementary slackness conditions have to hold for each edge in the optimal solution $(T^*_e)_{e \in G'_{M_0}}$ to the primal LP. That is, for each edge $(a, b) \in G'_{M_0}$, we have:

$$\text{either} \quad \alpha_a + \alpha_b = \mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(a, b) \quad \text{or} \quad T^*_{(a,b)} = 0. \tag{8}$$

Let $u \in R \cup H'$ be a vertex such that $(u, \ell(u)) \in M_0^*$, so $\alpha_u = 0$. If u is a resident, then $u \in R_1$; observe that all of u's neighbors are in H_1' – otherwise u would propose to its neighbor in H_0' who would accept its offer since any level 1 resident is preferred to its current partner (who is a level 0 resident). Similarly, if u is a hospital, then $u \in H_0'$ and all its neighbors are in R_0; otherwise u would be adjacent to some resident $r' \in R_1$ and u (being unmatched) would have accepted r_0''s proposal and r_1' would never have been activated in the 2-level Gale-Shapley algorithm.

In both cases every edge $(u, v) \in R \times H'$ that is incident on u in G'_{M_0} is *slack* because $(u, v) \in (R_0 \times H_0') \cup (R_1 \times H_1')$: thus $\alpha_u = 0$ and $\alpha_v = 1$ while $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(u, v) = \mathsf{vote}_u(v, \ell(u)) + \mathsf{vote}_v(u, M_0'(v)) = 1 - 1 = 0$. Thus it follows from Equation (8) that $T^*_{(u,v)} = 0$ for $v \neq \ell(u)$. Since T^* is $(R \cup H')$-complete, it follows that $(u, \ell(u)) \in T^*$. □

Now it is immediate to see that M_0 is a max-size popular matching in G. Let T be any popular matching in G. Consider the matching $T' = T^* \setminus \{(u, \ell(u)) : u \in R \cup H'\}$. Lemma 1 implies that $|T'| \leq |M_0'|$ because every vertex u left unmatched in M_0' has to be left unmatched in T' also. Since $|T| = |T'|$ and $|M_0'| = |M_0|$, we have $|T| \leq |M_0|$. As this holds for any popular matching T in G, we can conclude that M_0 is a max-size popular matching in G.

It is known that the Gale-Shapley algorithm for the hospitals/residents problem can be implemented to run in linear time [20]. Hence the 2-level Gale-Shapley algorithm also runs in linear time and we can conclude the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *A max-size popular matching in a hospitals/residents instance $G = (R \cup H, E)$ can be computed in linear time.*

Lemma 2 below shows that any matching T larger than M_0 cannot be weakly popular (see Definition 3) as $\Delta(M_0, T) > 0$ for such a matching. This implies that M_0 is also a max-size weakly popular matching in G.

Lemma 2. *If T is a matching such that $|T| > |M_0|$, then $\Delta(M_0, T) > 0$, i.e., M_0 is more popular than T.*

Proof. If T is a larger matching than M_0, then some vertices left unmatched in M_0 have to be matched in T. Thus for some $u \in R \cup H'$ such that $(u, \ell(u)) \in M_0^*$, the matching T^* contains an edge (u, v) where $v \neq \ell(u)$. Thus T^* contains a *slack* edge $(u, v) \in R \times H'$ since $\alpha_u = 0$, $\alpha_v = 1$ while $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(u, v) = 0$ (see the proof of Lemma 1).

It now follows from Equation (8) that T^* cannot be an optimal solution to the maximum weight $(R \cup H')$-complete matching problem in G'_{M_0}. Thus $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(T^*) < 0$, in other words, $\Delta(M_0, T) > 0$ since $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(T^*) = -\Delta(M_0, T)$. □

Remark. The above result implies that the following interesting property: for any definition of popularity that is "in between" popularity and weak popularity, the size of a max-size popular matching is the same. To formalize the meaning of "in between", consider the two relations on assignments $\succsim_p$ and $\succsim_{wp}$, where $M_0 \succsim_p M_1$ if $\Delta(M_0, M_1) \geq 0$ and $M_0 \succsim_{wp} M_1$ if $\Delta(M_1, M_0) \leq 0$, induced by popularity and weak popularity, respectively. Clearly, $\succsim_p \subseteq \succsim_{wp}$. Note that popular matchings and weakly popular matchings correspond to maximal elements of $\succsim_p$ and $\succsim_{wp}$, respectively.[4] Our result that M_0 is also a max-size maximal element of $\succsim_{wp}$ implies that if $\succsim$ is a relation on matchings (induced by an alternative notion of popularity) such that $\succsim_p \subseteq \succsim \subseteq \succsim_{wp}$, then M_0 is also a max-size maximal element of $\succsim$. Hence we can conclude the following proposition which even allows for different hospitals to compare sets of residents in different ways.

Proposition 1. *The size of a max-size popular matching in $G = (R \cup H, E)$ is robust to the way hospitals compare sets of residents as long as it is in between the most adversarial and the most favorable comparison.*

[4] M_0 is a maximal element of a relation $\succsim$ if for all elements M_1 we have: $M_1 \succsim M_0$ implies $M_0 \sim M_1$.

3.4 The rural hospitals theorem for max-size popular matchings

The rural hospitals theorem for stable matchings [23] does not necessarily hold for max-size popular matchings. That is, a hospital that is not matched up to capacity in some max-size popular matching is not necessarily matched to the same set of residents in every max-size popular matching.

Consider the instance $G = (R \cup H, E)$ with $R = \{r, r'\}$ and $H = \{h, h'\}$ and $\mathsf{cap}(h) = 1$ and $\mathsf{cap}(h') = 2$. The edge set is $R \times H$. The preferences are shown in the table below. The (max-size) popular matchings are $M = \{(r, h), (r', h')\}$ (in black) and $M' = \{(r, h'), (r', h)\}$ (in red). So h' is matched to a different resident in the two max-size popular matchings M and M'. Note that M' is not stable, as (r, h) is a blocking pair.

r: h, h'	h: r, r'
r': h, h'	h': r, r'



However Lemma 3 holds here. Such a result for max-size popular matchings in the one-to-one setting was shown in [12]. Our proof is based on linear programming and is different from the combinatorial proof in [12].

Lemma 3. *Let T be a max-size popular matching in G. Then T matches the same residents as M_0 and moreover, every hospital h is matched in T to the same capacity as it gets matched to in M_0.*

Proof. Consider the realization T^* of T such that T^* is an $(R \cup H')$-complete matching in G'_{M_0} and $\mathsf{wt}_{M_0}(T^*) = -\Delta(M_0, T)$. Since T is popular, we know that T^* has to include all the edges $(u, \ell(u))$ for vertices u left unmatched in M'_0 (by Lemma 1). Let $T' = T^* \setminus \{(u, \ell(u)) : u \in R \cup H'\}$. Every vertex in G'_{M_0} that is unmatched in M'_0 is left unmatched in T' also. We also have $|M'_0| = |M_0| = |T| = |T'|$ as both M_0 and T are max-size popular matchings in G. Hence T' and M'_0 match the same vertices in G'_{M_0}, i.e., T matches the same residents as M_0 and every hospital h is matched in T to the same capacity as it gets matched to in M_0. □

3.5 Other interesting properties

We show a non-trivial lower bound on the size of a max-size popular matching in G in Lemma 4. This proof is based on an analogous proof in [16] which shows such a result in the one-to-one setting.

Lemma 4. *We have $|M_0| \geq \frac{2}{3}|M_{\max}|$, where M_{max} is a maximum size matching in G.*

Proof. The size of the matching M_0 is exactly the same as M'_0. Consider the graph G'_{M_0} without last resort neighbors (call this graph G''_{M_0}) – we will show that every augmenting path with respect to M'_0 here has length at least 5. This will immediately imply that $|M'_0| \geq 2c/3$ where c is the size of the max-size matching in G''_{M_0}. The value $c \geq |M_{\max}|$ since corresponding to any matching T in G, we have a matching T' in G''_{M_0} such that $|T| = |T'|$. Thus the size of a largest matching in G''_{M_0} is at least $|M_{\max}|$ and so we get $|M_0| \geq 2|M_{\max}|/3$.

Consider any augmenting path p with respect to M'_0 in the graph G''_{M_0} (see Fig. 2) – let the endpoints of p be r and h_i. Since these vertices are left unmatched in M'_0, it follows that $r \in R_1$ and $h_i \in H'_0$. As seen in the proof of Lemma 1, the vertex r_1 is adjacent only to vertices in H'_1 in the graph G''_{M_0} and the unmatched vertex h_i is adjacent only to vertices in R_0 in the graph G''_{M_0}. Every vertex in R_0 is matched in M_0 to a neighbor in H'_0 and every vertex in H'_1 is matched in M_0 to a neighbor in R_1. Thus the shortest augmenting path with respect to M'_0 has the following structure with respect to the sets in $\{R_0, R_1, H'_0, H'_1\}$ that its vertices belong to: R_1-H'_1-R_1-H'_0-R_0-H'_0, i.e., its length is at least 5. □

Lemma 5 below states that a stable matching is a *min-size* popular matching in G. Such a result in the one-to-one setting was shown in [13] and our proof is inspired by their proof. In fact, the proof of Lemma 5 will show that a stable matching is a *min-size weakly popular matching* in G.

Lemma 5. *A stable matching S is a min-size popular matching in G.*



Fig. 2. An augmenting path with respect to M'_0 in the graph G''_{M_0}: the vertices r, r' have to belong to R_1 while the vertices h_i, h''_j have to belong to H'_0. Thus the length is of this path is ≥ 5.

Proof. Let T be a matching in G such that $|T| < |S|$. Consider a realization T^* of the matching T in the graph G'_S as described in the proof of Theorem 1 such that T^* is $(R \cup H')$-complete and $\mathtt{wt}_S(T^*) = -\Delta(S,T)$. Recall that S is a stable matching in G – hence for each edge e in G'_S, we have $\mathtt{wt}_S(e) \leq 0$. Moreover, because $|T| < |S|$, there is a resident r that is matched to a genuine neighbor in S, however T^* contains the edge $e = (r, \ell(r))$. We have $\mathtt{wt}_S(e) = -1$. Thus $\mathtt{wt}_S(T^*) < 0$. In other words, $\Delta(S,T) > 0$ and T is unpopular. Since S is a popular matching in G, it means that S is a min-size popular matching in G. □

We would like to remark that the 2-level Gale-Shapley algorithm and our analysis extend to the *many-to-many* setting as well. Here every vertex u in the instance $G = (A \cup B, E)$ has a capacity $\mathtt{cap}(u) \geq 1$ associated with it and seeks $\mathtt{cap}(u)$ many partners in a matching. Thus a max-size popular matching in such an instance can also be computed in linear time.

Acknowledgments. The first author wishes to thank Larry Samuelson for comments on the motivation for popular matchings. The second author wishes to thank David Manlove and Bruno Escoffier for asking her about popular matchings in the hospitals/residents problem.

References

1. D.J. Abraham, R.W. Irving, T. Kavitha, and K. Mehlhorn. *Popular matchings.* SIAM Journal on Computing, 37(4): 1030–1045, 2007.
2. G. Askalidis, N. Immorlica, A. Kwanashie, D. Manlove, and E. Pountourakis. *Socially Stable matchings in the Hospitals/Residents problem.* In the 13th International Symposium on Algorithms and Data Structures (WADS): 85–96, 2013.
3. P. Biro, R. W. Irving, and D. F. Manlove. *Popular Matchings in the Marriage and Roommates Problems.* In the 7th International Conference in Algorithms and Complexity (CIAC): 97–108, 2010.
4. Canadian Resident Matching Service. *How the matching algorithm works.* Web document available at `http://carms.ca/algorithm.htm`.
5. Á. Cseh, C.-C. Huang, and T. Kavitha. *Popular matchings with two-sided preferences and one-sided ties.* In the 42nd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP): Part I, 367–379, 2015.
6. Á. Cseh and T. Kavitha. *Popular edges and dominant matchings.* In the 18th International Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (IPCO): 138–151, 2016.
7. D. Gale and L.S. Shapley. *College admissions and the stability of marriage.* American Mathematical Monthly, 69(1): 9–15, 1962.
8. D. Gale and M. Sotomayor. *Some remarks on the stable matching problem.* Discrete Applied Mathematics, 11(3): 223–232, 1985.
9. P. Gärdenfors. *Match making: assignments based on bilateral preferences.* Behavioural Sciences, 20(3): 166–173, 1975.
10. D. Gusfield and R. W. Irving. *The Stable Marriage Problem: Structure and Algorithms.* MIT Press, Boston, MA 1989.
11. K. Hamada, K. Iwama, Shuichi Miyazaki. *The Hospitals/Residents Problem with Lower Quotas.* Algorithmica, 74(1): 440–465, 2016.
12. M. Hirakawa, Y. Yamauchi, S. Kijima, and M. Yamashita. *On The Structure of Popular Matchings in The Stable Marriage Problem - Who Can Join a Popular Matching?* In the 3rd International Workshop on Matching Under Preferences (MATCH-UP), 2015.

13. C.-C. Huang and T. Kavitha. *Popular matchings in the stable marriage problem.* Information and Computation, 222: 180–194, 2013.
14. R. W. Irving, D. F. Manlove, and S. Scott. *The Hospitals/Residents Problem with Ties.* In the 7th Scandinavian Workshop on Algorithm Theory (SWAT): 259–271, 2000.
15. R. W. Irving, D. F. Manlove, and S. Scott. *Strong Stability in the Hospitals/Residents Problem.* In the 20th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS): 439–450, 2003.
16. T. Kavitha. *A size-popularity tradeoff in the stable marriage problem.* SIAM Journal on Computing, 43(1): 52–71, 2014.
17. T. Kavitha. *Popular half-integral matchings.* In the 43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP), Track A: 290–302, 2016.
18. T. Kavitha, J. Mestre, and M. Nasre. *Popular mixed matchings.* Theoretical Computer Science, 412(24): 2679–2690, 2011.
19. D. F. Manlove. *Algorithmics of Matching Under Preferences.* World Scientific Publishing Company Incorporated, 2013.
20. D. F. Manlove. *The Hospitals/Residents Problem.* Encyclopedia of Algorithms: 926–930, 2015.
21. National Resident Matching Program. *Why the Match?* Web document available at `http://www.nrmp.org/whythematch.pdf`.
22. A. E. Roth. *The evolution of the labor market for medical interns and residents: a case study in game theory.* Journal of Political Economy: 92(6): 991–1016, 1984.
23. A.E. Roth *On the allocation of residents to rural hospitals: A general property of two-sided matching markets.* Econometrica, Vol. 54(2): 425–427, 1986.